



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/673,105

09/26/2003

Andrew D. Flockhart

4366-113

2566

48500

7590

10/18/2010

SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

1560 BROADWAY, SUITE 1200

DENVER, CO 80202

EXAMINER

CHONG CRUZ, NADJA N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/18/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/673,105
Filing Date: September 26, 2003
Appellant(s): FLOCKHART ET AL.

Andrew D. Flockhart et al.
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed on 7 September 2010 appealing from the Office action mailed on 31 March 2010.

(1) Real Party in Interest

The examiner has no comment on the statement, or lack of statement, identifying by name the real party in interest in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The following is a list of claims that are rejected and pending in the application:

Claims 55-76, 78-88 and 89-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 55-76, 78-88 and 89-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The examiner has no comment on the summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal. Every ground of rejection set forth in the Office action from which the appeal is taken (as modified by any advisory actions) is being

Art Unit: 3623

maintained by the examiner except for the grounds of rejection (if any) listed under the subheading "WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS." New grounds of rejection (if any) are provided under the subheading "NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION."

(7) Claims Appendix

The examiner has comment on the copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the appellant's brief. Examiner notes that in claim 55, the sequence of the steps start at (m) instead of (a) as previously submitted on 12/1/2009. Therefore, the sequence of steps from claims 58, 62-66, 69, 72, 74-76 does not match with claim 55. Further, it seems that some element from claims 55-76, 78-88 and 90-100 contains an additional numerical identification e.g., a contact center 6, first queue 38, first set of resources 14, however the claims submitted on 12/1/2009 does not include those additional numerical identification.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

EP 1246097 A1	BRITISH	10-2002
	TELECOMMUNICATIONS	
US 2002/0131399 A1	PHILONENKO	09-2002
US 6,546,087 B2	SHAFFER ET AL	05-2000
US 2002/0029213 A1	BORISSOV ET AL	03-2002
US 6,519,570 B1	FABER ET AL	02-2003

OFFICIAL NOTICE as evidenced by MORRIS ET AL, Sardine: Dynamic Seller Strategies in an Auction Marketplace, EC'00, ACM.

SPRAETZ, Out with the new, in with the old: A look at scheduling alternatives, Customer Inter@ction Solutions; Nov. 2001: 20,5.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
2. Claims 55-76, 78-88 and 89-100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. As per claims 55, 78 and 90 recites *the processor comparing the first bid and second bid; based on the comparison, the processor selecting the first bid*. Examiner is not clear why a comparison is made between the two bids, when the claim states basically that the selected bid will be always the first bid. Appropriate correction is required.
4. As per claim 62 recites *comparing the received bids with a maximum acceptable bid*. Examiner is not clear why the comparison is made when as discussed above, the first bid is always selected. Appropriate correction is required.

5. As per claims 55, 78 and 90 recites *the types of enqueued contacts, the priorities of enqueued contacts and the times*. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 55, 57-64, 67, 71, 74-76, 90-91, 95 and 98-100 and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over British Telecommunications, European Patent Application EP 1 246 097 A1, published on October 2, 2002, hereinafter "BT" in view of Philonenko (US 2002/0131399 A1) further in view of Official Notice.

Claim 55:

BT as shown discloses a method, the method comprising:

- *wherein the work items; are serviced by a first set of resources comprising a plurality of members* (Figure 3 illustrates a first set of resources (e.g., Workgroup 1) wherein a workgroup comprises a plurality of members (e.g., workers) and Figure 4 illustrates in reference character s1 "Customer/Environment generate work item");

BT in figure 3 illustrates the structure of a work allocation system and figure 4 illustrates the operation of figure 3 e.g., work items allocation. Further BT teaches in ¶ 0014, that mediators "waits for the next offer on the next available work item s6" e.g., a queue of items. BT does not expressly teach the following limitations. However, Philonenko in an analogous art of allocating work items for the purpose of monitoring (¶ 0039) as shown does:

- *(a) a contact center providing a first queue to service work items; in the first queue; (b) a processor receiving a first work item and a second work item into the first queue (Figures 3 and 4 illustrates a Call Waiting Queue e.g., first queue, with a plurality of work items e.g., calls 1 to 7 and ¶ 0027: "processing of queued events may be performed by a CTI processor");*
- *(c) the processor monitoring the first queue for a plurality of wait times associated with enqueued work items in the first queue, an occupancy of the first queue, a number of available members of the first set of resources to service enqueued work items in the first queue, the types of enqueued contacts in the first queue, the priorities of enqueued contacts in the first queue, and anticipated workload levels for the members of the first set of resources (¶ 0039: "[t]he CTI application monitors switch 21 for incoming calls to a routing or call distribution point. The status of telephones at agent stations is also monitored" (e.g., a number of available members), "so*

the application has access to real-time information as to which logged-in agents are busy on a call and which are not” (e.g., an occupancy of a selected queue, a number of available members), ¶ 0055 which teaches a type of enqueued contact e.g., call 2 requires a Spanish-speaking agent, ¶ 0111 which teaches that “[t]his concept may be practiced to help load balance busy agents without losing clients due to long waiting periods (e.g., a plurality of wait times of selected enqueued work items) and see also figures 3 and 4 which illustrates the priorities of enqueued contacts and anticipated work load levels “Calls Waiting Queue”);

- *(d) based on the results of the monitoring step, the processor determining that the first enqueued work item in the first queue, cannot be serviced by the first set of resources (Figure 4 illustrates that the first set of resources, e.g., agent 1 is busy, therefore the work item e.g., call is assigned to agent 2, see also ¶ 0060);*
- *(f) based on the results of the monitoring step, the processor determining that the second enqueued work item, in the first queue, can be serviced by the first set of resources to meet a predetermined business policy, objective, or goal for a type of contact corresponding to the second enqueued work item (¶ 0055: “[a]ssume call 2 requires a Spanish-speaking agent and is now being placed and that agent 3 is now reported busy with call 1 (last placed call) with the status of*

agents 1, 2, and 4 being unchanged. In this instance, call 2 (now call 1) would be routed to agent 4.”);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify BT to include the teaching of Philonenko e.g., monitoring because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Further, BT teaches:

- *(e) based on the results of the monitoring step, the processor determining that the first enqueued work, in the first queue, must be put up for bid to meet a predetermined business policy, objective or goal for a type of contact corresponding to the first enqueued work items* (¶ 0014 which teaches that “[t]he OSS agent 31 prices the work item” (e.g., a first enqueued work item in the first queue for a bid) “using a cost function that reflects its business priorities for example the urgency to work with respect to penalty clauses” (e.g., to meet a predetermined business policy, objective or goal for a type of contact), “or the value of the customer according to some model (step s4).);
- *(g) the processor determining the times to initiate and complete the bidding process, wherein the time is a function of an estimation of*

Art Unit: 3623

when the predetermined business policy, objective, or goal will be violated in the absence of servicing of the first work item (§ 0014 which teaches that “[t]he OSS agent 31 prices the work item using a cost function that reflects its business priorities, for example the urgency to work with respect to penalty clauses” (e.g., violation in the absence of servicing the first work item), “or the value of the customer according to some model (step s4). For example, the OSS agent 31 will price urgent work low, so that it is easier for the mediator agents 28, 29 to buy it”, therefore, the OSS agent determine the times to initiates and complete the bidding process in order to provide a service to a work item by reflecting its business priorities, see also figure 4 which illustrates the bidding process);

- *(h) the processor requesting a first member and a second members of a second set of resources to submit a bid to service the first work item (§ 0014 which teaches that “[t]he mediator agent 29 for the second workgroup 21” (e.g., a second set of resources) “also determines that it can allocate the work item to its workers,” (e.g., submit a bid to service the first work item) “who are not very busy, so that the work item will assist the workgroup in reaching its targets. The second mediator agent 29 is therefore prepared to offer P+10 for the work item. In this case, the OSS agent 31 accepts the offer of P+10 from the second mediator agent 29 and allocates the work item*

to it” wherein “[t]he mediator agent 29 then allocates/sells the work on to the workers (step s15)” (e.g., the first and second members of the second set or resources), see also figure 4);

- *(i) the processor receiving a first bid, from the first member and a second bid from the second member, to service the first work item* (§ 0014 which teaches that “[t]he OSS agent 31 receives bids” (e.g., first and second bids) “from all workgroups” (e.g., from the first and second members) “and determines how many bids it has received for the work item” (e.g., the first work item), see also figure 4);
- *(j) the processor comparing the first bid and second bid; (k) based on the comparison, the processor selecting the first bid;* (§ 0014 which teaches that “[i]f more than one mediator agent makes a bid (step s11) the OSS agent 31 accepts the bid at the highest price” therefore in order to select the highest price a comparison between bids have been made by the OSS agent, see also figure 4);
- *and (i) the processor assigning the first work item to the first member for servicing* (Figure 4 which it illustrates in reference s15 “[a]llocate work item to workers” (e.g., the first work item to the first member));

Claim 57:

BT as shown discloses the following limitation:

- *wherein bids are requested only during a first operational mode in which bidding is performed and not in a second operational mode in which bidding is not performed, the first and second operational modes are discrete from each other* (Figure 4, which it illustrates a first operational mode in which bidding is performed (e.g., “s9” through “s15”) and a second operational mode in which bidding is not performed (e.g., “s8” and “s6”) where both modes are being temporally discrete from each other);

Claim 58:

BT teaches that “the mediator agent 28, 29 calculates whether the allocation of the work will meet its local business priorities, for example targets for total work time for its workgroup and therefore whether it should make a bid at all (step s8). As a result of the calculation, the mediator agent 28, 29 for the workgroup may decide not to bid for the work (step s8),” (BT, ¶ 0014) BT does not expressly teach the following limitations. However Philonenko in an analogous art of work allocation for the purpose of monitoring a predetermined workload level (Figure 3, ¶ 0039), as shown does:

- *wherein the monitoring step (c) and determining step (d) comprise the substeps: the processor monitoring at least the first queue of work items* (¶0039: which teaches that “[t]he CTI application monitors switch 21 for incoming calls to a routing or call-distribution point” as

shown in Figure 3 "Call Waiting Queue", see also figure 4 and ¶ 0058-0060);

- *the first queue of work items corresponding to a first set of internal resources for servicing work items in the at least one queue; and* (Figure 3, which teaches a first set of resources available (e.g., Agent 3 or Agent 2) for servicing work items in the queue (e.g., first queue));
- *the processor determining when a predetermined workload level exists in the first queue* (¶ 0129 and ¶ 0039: which teaches that "the priority queue limit in switch 135 at center 117 is 10 calls" (e.g., a predetermined workload level). Further, Philonenko teaches that "[t]he status of telephones at agent stations is also monitored, so the application has access to real-time information as to which logged-in agents are busy on a call and which are not. The application operates to command switch 21 to distribute calls on a FIFO basis to logged-in available agents");

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify BT to include the teaching of Philonenko because as explained above in claim 55.

Claim 59:

BT as shown discloses the following limitation:

Art Unit: 3623

- *wherein the predetermined workload level exists when there is a likelihood that a service goal for at least one work item in the first queue will not be satisfied* (§ 0014 which teaches that “[t]he OSS agent 31 prices the work item using a cost function that reflects its business priorities, for example the urgency of the work with respect to penalty clauses,” (e.g., a service goal for at least one work item in the first queue will not be satisfied) “or the value of the customer according to some model (step s4). For example, the OSS agent 31 will price urgent work low,” (e.g., a predetermined workload level exists) “so that it is easier for the mediator agents 28, 29 to buy it”);

Claim 60:

BT does not expressly teach the following limitations. However Philonenko in an analogous art of work allocation for the purpose of providing a predetermined workload level (Figure 3, § 0039), as shown does:

- *wherein the predetermined workload level exists when a queue position in the first queue is less than a number of work items ahead of the queue position in the first queue* (§ 0051: which teaches that “a broad variety of rules and conditions” (e.g., the first queue is less than a number of work items) “with regards to agents such as incorporating various sub-states such as E-mail duties, setting interrupt rules for particular agents, and so on.” Philonenko teaches that based on predetermined rules and conditions, “an agent residing

at agent station 33 may be reported busy because he is answering E-mails and cannot be interrupted by a telephone call unless it is of priority 7 or above. In this case, if there are no other agents available to take the priority 7 call, it will be routed to the agent at agent station 33. He will accept the call and suspend his E-mail duty until he has disposed of the call, and so on.”)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify BT to include the teaching of Philonenko because as explained above in claim 55.

Claim 61:

BT as shown discloses the following limitation:

- *determining a number and identities of work items to be presented for bidding to the second set of resources* (§ 0014 “the mediator agent 28, 29 calculates whether the allocation of the work will meet its local business priorities, for example targets for total work time for its workgroup” (e.g., workgroup 1 or 2, which both include members/workers) “and therefore whether it should make a bit at all (step s8));

Claim 62:

BT as shown discloses the following limitation:

- *wherein the selecting step (k) comprises: comparing the received bids with a maximum acceptable bid* (§ 0014 which teaches that “[i]f

more than one mediator agent makes a bid (step s11), the OSS agent 31 accepts the bid at the highest price (step s13));

Claim 63:

BT as shown discloses the following limitation:

- *wherein the selecting step (k) comprises: determining, for each bidding resource in the second set of resources, a composite value reflecting a plurality of a work item value, a resource value and a bid (Figure 3 illustrates a second set of resources (e.g., Workgroup 2), ¶ 0015-0016 which teaches that “[t]he mediator agent 29 then allocates/sells the work on to the workers (step s15)” wherein workers bid for a work item, further, “[t]he mediator agent 28, 29 prices work based on two factors, the value of the work to the overall business” (e.g., a plurality of a work time value) “as expressed by the OSS agent 31, namely the cost price to the mediator and a model of the impact of a particular agent performing a piece of work on the overall efficiency of the team” (e.g., a resource value), see also ¶ 0027 which disclose a composite value);*
- *and comparing the determined composite values to select a member from the second set of resources to service the first work item (¶ 0017 which teaches a comparison between two workers, wherein the work item is assigned to the worker (e.g., a member) that would most efficiently perform the work);*

Claim 64:

BT as shown discloses the following limitation:

- *further comprising after the receiving step (f): determining whether or not a workload level for the contact center requires the first work item that is the subject of the received bids to be serviced by a member in the second set of resources (¶ 0014 which teaches that “[t]he mediator agent 28 for the first workgroup 20 determines that it can allocate the work item to its workers, but its workgroup is relatively busy and cannot do the work urgently. It is therefore prepared to offer P for the work item. The mediator agent 29 for the second workgroup 21 also determines that it can allocate the work item to its workers, who are not very busy, so that the work item will assist the workgroup in reaching its targets.” BT teaches that when the first set is not available the second set bid for the work item);*

Claim 67:

BT as shown discloses the following limitation:

- *wherein the bid is at least one of a monetary service fee, a service time, an opportunity cost to the contact center for servicing the work item, and an overhead cost to the contact center for servicing the work item (¶ 0014: “the OSS agent 31 accepts the bid at the highest price” (e.g., a monetary service fee));*

Claims 71 and 95:

BT as shown discloses the following limitation:

- *wherein a number of work items to be put out for bid is a function of anticipated or expected future work item surplus levels and wherein identities of which work items are to be put out for bid is a function of at least one of relative values of work items, skill levels of available resources in the second set of resources, and types of work items* (§ 0014 which teaches that “[t]he OSS agent 31 prices the work item using a cost function that reflects its business priorities, for example the urgency of the work” (e.g., anticipated or expected future work item surplus levels) “with respect to penalty clauses, or the value of the customer according to some model (step s4).” Further, in § 0014-0017 teaches that “the OSS agent 31 provides a work item with a relatively high price P, indicating that the work item is categorized as desirable”);

BT does not expressly teaches a number of work items to be put out for bids as a function of anticipated or expected future work item surplus levels. However Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the bidding arts to submit a number of work items for bidding based on anticipated or expected future works item surplus levels as evidenced by Morris et al., Sardine: Dynamic Seller Strategies in an Auction Marketplace, EC’00, ACM as shown in page 6, col. 2, last paragraph “Beam et al. present pricing strategies for seller in a single-item auction and examine these strategies in real auction settings. They

Art Unit: 3623

discuss extensions for N-item auction and propose strategies for managing inventory surplus". Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify BT in view of Philonenko to include the teaching of Official Notice e.g., to put of for bidding surplus items, because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Claim 74:

BT as shown discloses the following limitation:

- *wherein step (k) comprises the sub-steps: (K1l) calculating, respectively, first and second composite values for the first and second members based on a plurality of a value of the first work item, the respective bid, and a skill level, experience level, and/or value of the member; and (Figure 3 illustrates a second set of resources (e.g., Workgroup 2), ¶ 0015-0016 which teaches that "[t]he mediator agent 29 then allocates/sells the work on to the workers (step s15)" wherein workers bid for a work item, further, "[t]he mediator agent 28, 29 prices work based on two factors, the value of the work to the overall business" (e.g., a plurality of a work time value) "as expressed by the OSS agent 31, namely the cost price to the mediator and a model of the impact of a particular agent performing a piece of work on the*

Art Unit: 3623

overall efficiency of the team” (e.g., a resource value: skill level, experience level, and/or value of the member), see also ¶ 0027 which disclose a composite value);

- *(k2) comparing the first and second composite values* (¶ 0017 which teaches a comparison between two workers, wherein the work item is assigned to the worker (e.g., a resource) that would most efficiently perform the work);

Claim 75:

BT as shown discloses the following limitation:

- *each resource value range having a different acceptable bid threshold* (¶ 0016-0017 which teaches that “[t]he mediator agent 28, 29 prices work based on two factors, the value of the work to the overall business as expressed by the OSS agent 31, namely the cost price to the mediator and a model of the impact of a particular agent performing a piece of work on the overall efficiency of the team” (e.g., a resource value). BT teaches that each worker have a different acceptable bid threshold based on a model of the impact of a particular agent toward the overall efficiency of the team);

BT does not expressly teach the following limitation. However, Philonenko in an analogous art of allocating work items for the purpose of mapping a resource value (¶ 0039) as shown does:

Art Unit: 3623

- *wherein steps (k) and (l) are performed by mapping a resource value of the first member against a resource value range* (Figures 3-4 illustrates the resource value of each agent e.g., Agent 2, Priority Level 6 accepted, and ¶ 0060 teaches that “[a]gent 2 is busy with a priority 6 call and can be interrupted with a lower priority call” “[a]gent 2 is now free to accept call 1”. Further in ¶ 0037 Philonenko “assign priority to incoming calls and to route calls to agents at the call center based on the assigned priority, together with information about agent skills” (e.g., resource value) “and status”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify BT to include the teaching of Philonenko e.g., monitoring because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Claim 76:

BT as shown discloses the following limitation:

- *each work item value range having a different acceptable bid threshold* (¶ 0014: “the OSS agent 31 provides a work item with a relatively high price P, indicating that the work item is categorized as desirable”, further “[t]he OSS agent 31 prices the work items using a cost function that reflects its business priorities”);

Art Unit: 3623

BT does not expressly teach the following limitation. However, Philonenko in an analogous art of allocating work items for the purpose of mapping a resource value (§ 0039) as shown does:

- *wherein steps (k) and (l) are performed by mapping a work item value of the first work item against a work item value range (§ 0054-0055 which teaches a work item value that requires a Spanish-speaking agent wherein it is assigned to Agent 2);*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify BT to include the teaching of Philonenko e.g., monitoring because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per **claim 90**, the claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 55. Accordingly, claim 90 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 55, as described above.

As per **claim 91**, the claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 56. Accordingly, claim 91 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 56, as described below.

As per **claim 98**, these claims encompass substantially the same scope as claim 74. Accordingly, claim 98 are rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 74, as described above.

As per **claim 99**, these claims encompass substantially the same scope as claim 75. Accordingly, claim 99 are rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 75, as described above.

As per **claim 100**, these claims encompass substantially the same scope as claim 76. Accordingly, claim 100 are rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 76, as described above.

8. Claims 56, 78-80, 83 and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over British Telecommunications, European Patent Application EP 1 246 097 A1, published on October 2, 2002, hereinafter "BT" in view of Philonenko (US 2002/0131399 A1) and Official Notice as applied to claims 55, 57-64, 67, 71, 74-76, 90-91, 95 and 98-100 further in view of Shaffer et al., (US 6,546,087 B2) hereinafter "Shaffer".

Claim 56:

BT as shown discloses the following limitation:

- *wherein the first set of resources comprises a plurality of resources internal to a contact center, wherein the second set of resources comprises a plurality of resources external to the contact center network* (¶¶ 0003, 0006, 0011 and Figure 3, which teaches that "a work allocation system for allocating work items between a plurality of workgroups" (e.g., different set of resources), "comprising a work source agent for providing a work item and a plurality of mediator agents, each associated with a respective workgroup, wherein each of

the mediator agents is configured to request the work item from the work source agent in dependence on preference data for its respective workgroup.”. Further, “[o]nce a work item is acquired, the mediator agent for a given workgroup can offer the work item to each of the workers in the workgroup”. Figure 3 illustrates two workgroups, Workgroup 1 and Workgroup 2, where “[t]he OSS 2 is provided with, or generates, a definition of a work project to be carried out by one or more workgroups 20, 21. Each workgroup 20, 21 includes a plurality of workers 22-24; 25-27, each of whom has access to a workgroup terminal 4, 5. Each of the workgroup terminals 4, 5 runs a software program referred to herein as a mediator agent 28,29, which is capable of communicating with the OSS 2 and each of a plurality of workers 22 - 27 in the workgroups 20, 21 via a graphical user interface (gui).”);

- *wherein the work item is a contact from a customer* (§ 0012: which teaches that “[c]ustomers 32, or the environment 33, generate work items that are acquired by the work item handler 30, for example a customer handling system, maintenance schedule or fault detector”);
- *and wherein the first work item is placed into a second queue of multiple work items for the second set of resources* (§ 0014 which teaches that “the mediator agent 28, 29 for the workgroup may decide not to bid for the work (step s8), but instead waits for the next offer on the next available work item (step s6)” where BT teaches that a first

work item is in a queue of multiple work items in order to wait for the next offer (e.g., work item));

BT does not expressly teach that workgroup 1 are not employees of the contact center, neither workgroup 2 are employees of the contact center. BT teaches that “a work allocation system for allocating work items between a plurality of workgroups” (e.g., different set of resources), “comprising a work source agent for providing a work item and a plurality of mediator agents, each associated with a respective workgroup” (BT, ¶ 0003). However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify BT by assigning a plurality of resources internal to a contact center as workgroup 1 and a plurality of resources external to a contact center as workgroup 2 because “[e]ach workgroup 20, 21 includes a plurality of workers 22-24; 25-27, each of whom has access to a workgroup terminal 4, 5. Each of the workgroup terminals 4, 5 runs a software program referred to herein as a mediator agent 28, 29, which is capable of communicating with the OSS 2 and each of a plurality of workers 22 - 27 in the workgroups 20, 21 via a graphical user interface (gui).” (BT, ¶ 0011) In addition, it is old and well known in work allocation art to outsource resources in order to lower cost and to minimize unanswered and unattended inbound calls.

BT teaches in ¶ 0014, that mediators “waits for the next offer on the next available work item s6” e.g., a queue of items. Philonenko teaches in ¶ 0044: “an incoming call may be first connected to an IVR for the purpose of determining a

Art Unit: 3623

client's intent, and then the system may assign priority and place the call in the queue according to the elicited information, or in conjunction with other information.” And ¶ 0129: “Once the priority queue is full then the DN is marked unavailable unless a higher priority request comes in. If this happens, a lowest priority call in queue is either transferred to an overflow queue, to an IVR, or it may be dumped.” BT and Philonenko are silent about a second queue. However, Shaffer in an analogous art of allocating work items for the purpose of providing a second queue (col. 7, lines 65-67 to col. 8, lines 1-6) as shown does:

- *a second queue* (col. 7, lines 65-67 to col. 8, lines 1-6: “the IVR techniques may be employed within a ToL-based ACD system. After the routing system determines the appropriate agent queue that is to handle a customer call, the ACD system transmits an H.323 camp-on request containing the telephone number of the customer to the ToL server that supports the selected agent group queue. IVR prompts are used to collect the necessary information for selecting the agent group queue and for returning the call”);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify BT in view of Philonenko to include the teaching of Shaffer e.g., a second queue and routing, because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Claim 78:

The limitations of claim 78 encompass substantially the same scope as claim 55. Accordingly, those similar limitations are rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 55, as described above. The following are the limitations of claim 78 that differ from claim 55.

BT as shown discloses a contact center, the contact center comprising:

- *a memory operable to store one or more computer executable instructions (Figure 2)*
- *a processor in communication with the first queue, the second queue, and the memory, the processor operable to execute the computer executable instructions, wherein the processor executes the computer executable instructions to execute (Figures 1 and 2)*
- *a second sets of resources to service work items; the second set of resources comprising a plurality of members (Figure 3 illustrates a second set of resources (e.g., Workgroup 2) wherein a workgroup comprises a plurality of members (e.g., workers));*
- *the workload monitoring agent operable to send the first work item to a bid item selecting agent (Figure 4);*
- *the bid item selecting agent operable (Figures 3 and 4)*

BT in figure 3 illustrates the structure of a work allocation system and figure 4 illustrates the operation of figure 3 e.g., work items allocation. Further BT teaches

Art Unit: 3623

in ¶ 0014, that mediators “waits for the next offer on the next available work items” e.g., a queue of items. Philonenko teaches in ¶ 0044: “an incoming call may be first connected to an IVR for the purpose of determining a client's intent, and then the system may assign priority and place the call in the queue according to the elicited information, or in conjunction with other information.” And ¶ 0129: “Once the priority queue is full then the DN is marked unavailable unless a higher priority request comes in. If this happens, a lowest priority call in queue is either transferred to an overflow queue, to an IVR, or it may be dumped.” BT and Philonenko are silent about a second queue. However, Shaffer in an analogous art of allocating work items for the purpose of providing a second queue and routing (col. 7, lines 65-67 to col. 8, lines 1-6) as shown does:

- *a second queue to hold work item; in the second queue; to queue the first work item in the second work queue for the first member (col. 7, lines 65-67 to col. 8, lines 1-6: “the IVR techniques may be employed within a ToL-based ACD system. After the routing system determines the appropriate agent queue that is to handle a customer call, the ACD system transmits an H.323 camp-on request containing the telephone number of the customer to the ToL server that supports the selected agent group queue. IVR prompts are used to collect the necessary information for selecting the agent group queue and for returning the call”);*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify BT in view of Philonenko to include the teaching of Shaffer e.g., a second queue and routing, because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per **claim 79**, this claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 56. Accordingly, those similar limitations are rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 56, as described above.

As per **claim 83**, this claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 71. Accordingly, claim 83 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 71, as described above.

As per **claim 86**, this claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 74. Accordingly, claim 86 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 74, as described above.

As per **claim 87**, this claim encompasses the same scope as claim 75. Accordingly, claim 87 and is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 75, as described above.

As per **claim 88**, this claim encompasses the same scope as claim 76. Accordingly, claim 88 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 76, as described above.

Art Unit: 3623

9. Claims 65-66, 72-73, 92 and 96-97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over British Telecommunications, European Patent Application EP 1 246 097 A1, published on October 2, 2002, hereinafter "BT" in view of Philonenko (US 2002/0131399 A1) further in view of Official Notice as applied to claims 55, 57-64, 67, 71, 74-76, 90-91, 95 and 98-100 above further in view of Borissov et al., (US 2002/0029213 A1) hereinafter "Borissov".

Claim 65:

BT as shown discloses the following limitation:

- *and receiving, from the at least one member, an additional bids after the displaying step* (¶ 0014: "[t]he OSS agent 31 receives bids from all workgroups);

BT provides offers to mediator agents (BT, figure 4). Philonenko teaches that "[s]tations 147-153 are equipped with agent-operated personal computer/video display units" (¶ 0075). The combination of BT and Philonenko do not expressly teach displaying bids information to the resources. However, Borissov in an analogous art of allocating work items for the purpose of displaying information (¶ 0091) as shown does:

- *displaying at least one of the first and second bid and/or information associated with the at least one of the first and second bids to at least one member in the second set of resources* (¶ 0091: "[t]he list displays basic information such as opening and closing times for bidding and time remaining until closing for each need");

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify BT in view of Philonenko to include the teaching of Borissov because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Claim 66:

BT as shown discloses the following limitation:

- *wherein at least some of the resources are human agents (figure 3, workers 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 27);*
- *wherein members of the first set of resources are employees of a contact center, wherein the members of the first set of resources are subscribers to an enterprise network defined by the contact center, wherein the members of the second set of resources are not employees of the contact center, wherein the members of the second set of resources are not subscribers to an enterprise network defined by the contact center, and wherein steps (g)-(l) are performed when the first set of resources is unable to service the contact as required by contact center policies, objectives, and/or goals, the first set of resources being employees of the contact center and subscribers of the enterprise network (¶ 0003, 0006, 0011 and Figure 3, which teaches that “a work allocation system for allocating work items*

between a plurality of workgroups” (e.g., first and second set of resources), “comprising a work source agent for providing a work item and a plurality of mediator agents, each associated with a respective workgroup, wherein each of the mediator agents is configured to request the work item from the work source agent in dependence on preference data for its respective workgroup.”. Further, “[o]nce a work item is acquired, the mediator agent for a given workgroup can offer the work item to each of the workers in the workgroup”. Figure 3 illustrates two workgroups, Workgroup 1 and Workgroup 2, where “[t]he OSS 2 is provided with, or generates, a definition of a work project to be carried out by one or more workgroups 20, 21. Each workgroup 20, 21 includes a plurality of workers 22-24; 25-27, each of whom has access to a workgroup terminal 4, 5. Each of the workgroup terminals 4, 5 runs a software program referred to herein as a mediator agent 28,29, which is capable of communicating with the OSS 2 and each of a plurality of workers 22 - 27 in the workgroups 20, 21 via a graphical user interface (gui).”);

BT does not expressly teach that workgroup 1 are not employees of the contact center, neither workgroup 2 are employees of the contact center. BT teaches that “a work allocation system for allocating work items between a plurality of workgroups” (e.g., first and second set of resources), “comprising a

Art Unit: 3623

work source agent for providing a work item and a plurality of mediator agents, each associated with a respective workgroup” (BT, ¶ 0003). However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to modify BT by assigning a set of resources that are employees of the contact center to workgroup 1 and a set of resources that are not employees of the contact center to workgroup 2 because “[e]ach workgroup 20, 21 includes a plurality of workers 22-24; 25-27, each of whom has access to a workgroup terminal 4, 5. Each of the workgroup terminals 4, 5 runs a software program referred to herein as a mediator agent 28, 29, which is capable of communicating with the OSS 2 and each of a plurality of workers 22 - 27 in the workgroups 20, 21 via a graphical user interface (gui).” (BT, ¶ 0011) In addition, it is old and well known in work allocation art to outsource resources in order to lower cost and to minimize unanswered and unattended inbound calls.

As per **claim 92**, these claims encompass substantially the same scope as claim 66. Accordingly, claim 92 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 66, as described above.

Claim 72:

The combination of BT and Philonenko do not expressly teach the following limitations. However, Borissov in an analogous art of allocating work items for the purpose of displaying information (¶ 0091) as shown does:

- *wherein steps (h) and (i) comprise: publishing on work stations of the first member and the second members of the second set of resources*

a plurality of a description of the first work item, an acceptable bid threshold, a closure time for bidding, an indication whether bids may be changed by a bidder, and how many times a bid may be changed by a bidder (§ 0091-0092 which teaches “[t]he list displays basic information such as opening and closing times for bidding and time remaining until closing for each need”, “all current bids together with the associated preferences indicated by each bidder will be displayed to participants consultants” (e.g., the first member and the second members of the second set of resources). See also Figure 2);

- *when a bid is received, providing the bidder with an indication whether or not his bid is less than, greater than or equal to an acceptable bid threshold* (§ 0044 and Figure 2 illustrates after submitting a bid the option to increase a bid);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify BT in view of Philonenko to include the teaching of Borissov because as discussed above in claim 65.

As per **claim 96**, these claims encompass substantially the same scope as claim 72. Accordingly, claim 96 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 72, as described above.

Claim 73:

BT as shown discloses the following limitation:

- *wherein the acceptable bid threshold is a function of one or more of a value of the work item that is the subject of the bid, a cost for a member of the second set of resources to service the work item that is the subject of the bid, and an amount of surplus work items to be serviced* (§ 0014 which teaches that “[i]f more than one mediator agent makes a bid (step s11) the OSS agent 31 accepts the bid at the highest price” (e.g., the value of the work item));

As per **claim 97**, these claims encompass substantially the same scope as claim 73. Accordingly, claim 97 are rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 73, as described above.

10. Claim 68 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over British Telecommunications, European Patent Application EP 1 246 097 A1, published on October 2, 2002, hereinafter “BT” in view of Philonenko (US 2002/0131399 A1) further in view of Official Notice as applied to claims 55, 57-64, 67, 71, 74-76, 90-91, 95 and 98-100 in view of Spraeztz, Out with the new, in with the old: A look at scheduling alternatives, Customer Inter@ction Solutions; Nov. 2001: 20,5.

Claim 68:

BT and Philonenko do not expressly teach the following limitation. However, Spraeztz in an analogous art of allocating work items for the purpose of schedule bidding (page 48, column 1, 2nd ¶) as shown does:

- *wherein a plurality of work items are put out for bid and further comprising: dynamically varying a bidding time for each of the plurality*

of work items (page 50, 2nd column, 3rd ¶ which teaches that “the effects of agent turnover and changes in contact volumes” (e.g., a plurality of work items) are put out for bid (e.g., schedule bidding) during a “bid cycle” (e.g., dynamically varying a bidding time) “to fill in the gaps”);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to bid a plurality of work items by dynamically varying a bidding time (e.g., bid cycle) as taught by Spraeztz, to improve Philonenko, thereby giving the predictable result of optimizing “resource use and meet service goals.” (Spraeztz, page 50, 1st column, 3rd ¶).

11. Claims 69-70 and 93-94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over British Telecommunications, European Patent Application EP 1 246 097 A1, published on October 2, 2002, hereinafter “BT” in view of Philonenko (US 2002/0131399 A1) further in view of Official Notice as applied to claims 55, 57-64, 67, 71, 74-76, 90-91, 95 and 98-100 above further in view of Faber et al., (US 6,519,570 B1) hereinafter “Faber”.

Claim 69:

BT teaches that “the mediator agent 28, 29 for the workgroup may decide not to bid for the work (step s8), but instead waits for the next offer on the next available work item (step s6)” where BT teaches that a first work item is in a queue of multiple work items in order to wait for the next offer (e.g., work item)); (BT, ¶ 0014). BT does not expressly teaches the following limitations, however,

Art Unit: 3623

Philonenko in an analogous art of allocating work items for the purpose of determining queue positions (Figures 3 and 4) as shown does:

- wherein at least one of steps (g) and (h) comprise: determining a required queue position for each work item in the first queue, wherein the required queue position indicates that a service-time goal of the respective work item_i is met only when the respective work item_i is serviced by a one of the next "N_i" resources in the first set of resources to become available to service work items in the first queue (Figures 3 and 4 illustrates the required queue position for each work item indicating when a resource is available to service the work item in a first queue);*
- and for each queue position "i" in the queue representation, summing the work items in queue positions 1 to N_i; and for each queue position "N_i" when the sum is greater than N_i, performing steps (h) - (l) (¶ 0043-0045 which teaches that "information may be elicited from callers (clients) at processing points in the network, and the information transferred to the call center with or ahead of the call. This information may be sorted and used according to preprogrammed rules to assign priority. [...] Many such possibilities are extant for priority determination and assignment. ");*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify BT to include the teaching of Philonenko because as explained above in claim 55.

The combination of BT and Philonenko do not expressly teach the following limitation. However, Faber in an analogous art of conducting a time action for the purpose of generating a queue representation (col. 5, lines 25-29) as shown does:

- *generating a representation of a queue, the representation reflecting a required queue positions for the work items in the first queue (col. 5, lines 25-29 which teaches that “a graphical representation of the customer’s position 1121 in the queue 1120”)*

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify BT in view of Philonenko to include the teaching of Faber because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As per **claim 93**, these claims encompass substantially the same scope as claim 69. Accordingly, claim 93 are rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 69, as described above.

Claims 70 and 94:

BT as shown discloses the following limitation:

- *wherein a number by which a sum exceeds N_i is a number of work items to be put out for bid and an initial queue position in the representation of a queue at where the sum is greater than N_i , is used to determine a time available for the bidding process to be completed* (¶ 0014 which teaches that “[t]he OSS agent 31 prices the work item using a cost function that reflects its business priorities, for example the urgency to work with respect to penalty clauses” (e.g., violation in the absence of servicing the first work item), “or the value of the customer according to some model (step s4). For example, the OSS agent 31 will price urgent work low, so that it is easier for the mediator agents 28, 29 to buy it”, therefore, the OSS agent determine the times to initiates and complete the bidding process in order to provide a service to a work item by reflecting its business priorities);

12. Claims 80 and 84-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over British Telecommunications, European Patent Application EP 1 246 097 A1, published on October 2, 2002, hereinafter “BT” in view of Philonenko (US 2002/0131399 A1), Official Notice and Shaffer et al., (US 6,546,087 B2) hereinafter “Shaffer” as applied to claims 78-80 and 86 above further in view of Borissov et al., (US 2002/0029213 A1) hereinafter “Borissov”.

As per **claim 80**, this claim encompasses substantially the same scope as claim 66. Accordingly, claim 80 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 66, as described above.

Art Unit: 3623

As per **claim 84**, these claims encompass substantially the same scope as claim 72. Accordingly, claim 84 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 72, as described above.

As per **claim 85**, these claims encompass substantially the same scope as claim 73. Accordingly, claim 85 are rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 73, as described above.

13. Claims 81-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over British Telecommunications, European Patent Application EP 1 246 097 A1, published on October 2, 2002, hereinafter "BT" in view of Philonenko (US 2002/0131399 A1), Official Notice and Shaffer et al., (US 6,546,087 B2) hereinafter "Shaffer" as applied to claims 78-80 and 86 above further in view of Faber et al., (US 6,519,570 B1) hereinafter "Faber".

As per **claim 81**, these claims encompass substantially the same scope as claim 69. Accordingly, claim 81 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 69, as described above.

As per **claim 82**, these claims encompass substantially the same scope as claim 70. Accordingly, claim 82 is rejected in substantially the same manner as claim 70, as described above.

(10) Response to Argument

In the Appeal Brief, Appellant presents the following arguments:

- 1) Whether the plain meaning of the independent claims is easily understood and precludes a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.
- 2) Whether the combination of Philonenko and Official Notice, without teaching “first set of resources 14 comprising a plurality of members” can service a first and second work items and two members of a second set of resources bidding to address the work item, can render the claim obvious.

Claim 55

- 3) There is no teaching, suggestion or description in Philonenko of two sets of resources.
- 4) Philonenko does not teach "the processor monitoring the first queue for a plurality of wait times associated with enqueued work items in the first queue, an occupancy of the first queue, a number of available members of the first set of resources to service enqueued work items in the first queue, the types of enqueued contacts in the first queue, the priorities of enqueued contacts in the first queue, and anticipated workload levels [for the members of the first set of resources".
- 5) BT does not teach “based on the results of the monitoring step, the processor determining that the first enqueued work item, in the first

Art Unit: 3623

queue, cannot be serviced by the first set of resources..., determining that the first enqueued work item, in the first queue, must be put up for bid to meet a predetermined business policy, objective, or goal for a type of contact corresponding to the first enqueued work item".

- 6) BT in view of Philonenko does not teach "based on the results of the monitoring step, the processor determining that the second enqueued work item, in the first queue, can be serviced by the first set of resources to meet a predetermined business policy, objective, or goal for a type of contact corresponding to the second enqueued work item".
- 7) BT does not teach "the processor determining the times to initiate and complete the bidding process, wherein the time is a function of an estimation of when the predetermined business policy, objective, or goal will be violated in the absence of servicing of the first work item". The OSS agent does not determine that bids will received from time 0 to time x as claimed.
- 8) BT does not describe a first set of resources and then a second set of resources, each with two or more members.

Claims 56-77, 79-89 and 91-100

- 9) Claims 56-77, 79-89 and 91-100 are allowable over the cited art.

Claims 78 and 90

- 10) For similar reason as claim 55, claims 78 and 90 are allowable over the cited art.

In response to argument 1, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Appellant's claim recites "(j) the processor comparing, the first bid and second bid; (k) based on the comparison, the processor selecting the first bid". In a broadest reasonable interpretation, the processor is comparing two bids, first bid e.g., "A" and second bid e.g., "B", the next step of the claimed invention, based on the comparison, (comparing first bid "A" with second bid "B"), the processor selects the first bid, e.g., bid A, Examiner is not clear about the scope of the claim, why a comparison is made between the two bids, when the claim states basically that the selected bid will be always the first bid, the processor compares two bids, first bid and second bid, then the next step, the processor will select the first bid.

In response to argument 2, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner notes that is the combination of BT, Philonenko and Official Notice that teaches "first set of resources 14 comprising a plurality of members". Please see the response to arguments 4-8.

In response to argument 3, Examiner respectfully disagrees. BT is the prior art of record that teaches, suggests or describes two set of resources. Please see the response to argument 8.

In response to argument 4, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Philonenko does teach all the elements that the processor monitors in ¶ 0039: "[t]he CTI application monitors switch 21 for incoming calls to a routing or call distribution point. The status of telephones at agent stations is also monitored" (e.g., a number of available members), "so the application has access to real-time

Art Unit: 3623

information as to which logged-in agents are busy on a call and which are not” (e.g., an occupancy of a selected queue, a number of available members), ¶ 0055 which teaches a type of enqueued contact e.g., call 2 requires a Spanish-speaking agent, ¶ 0111 which teaches that “[t]his concept may be practiced to help load balance busy agents without losing clients due to long waiting periods (e.g., a plurality of wait times of selected enqueued work items) and see also figures 3 and 4 which illustrates the priorities of enqueued contacts “priority assignment” and anticipated work load levels “Calls Waiting Queue”, see also Abstract: “one data queue for queuing incoming events”.

In response to argument 5, Examiner respectfully disagrees. It is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., *the claim requires that a determination be made as to whether a bidding process should be completed for a work item*) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). The claim does not recite as to whether a bidding process should be completed or not since the claim recites that “the first enqueued item, in the first queue, must be put up for bid”, With regard to the limitation *based on the results of the monitoring step, the processor determining that the first enqueued work item in the first queue, cannot be serviced by the first set of resources*, Philonenko teaches in Figure 4 that the first set of resources, e.g., agent 1 is busy, therefore the work item e.g., call is assigned to agent 2, see also ¶ 0060. Further, BT teaches *the processor determining that the first enqueued work, in the first queue, must be put up for bid to meet a predetermined business policy, objective or goal for a type of contact*

corresponding to the first enqueued work items in ¶ 0014 that “[t]he OSS agent 31 prices the work item” (e.g., a first enqueued work item in the first queue for a bid) “using a cost function that reflects its business priorities for example the urgency to work with respect to penalty clauses” (e.g., to meet a predetermined business policy, objective or goal for a type of contact), “or the value of the customer according to some model (step s4).” “[t]he OSS agent 31 will price urgent work low” (e.g., predetermined business policy, objective or goal for at type of contact) “so that it is easier for the mediator agents 28, 29 to buy it” e.g., bid for it., Further, “[t]he mediator agents 28, 29 for each workgroups receives the offer (step s6) and uses a cost function that reflects its local business priorities, and the preferences of its workgroup, to determine a price at which it is prepared to bid for the work (step s7)”.

In response to argument 6, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Philonenko teaches in ¶ 0055: “[a]ssume call 2” (e.g., second enqueued work item) “requires a Spanish-speaking agent” (e.g., to meet a predetermined business policy, objective or goal for a type of contact corresponding to the second enqueued work item) “and is now being placed and that agent 3 is now reported busy with call 1 (last placed call) with the status of agents 1, 2, and 4 being unchanged. In this instance, call 2 (now call 1) would be routed to agent 4.” In addition, ¶ 0056: “[a]ll calls in queue 69 are routed according to priority and according to agent availability with regards to multiple active states of agents”.

In response to argument 7, Examiner respectfully disagrees. It is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., *determine the bids will be received from time 0 to time x*) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Further BT teaches in ¶ 0014 that “[t]he OSS agent 31 prices the work item using a cost function that reflects its business priorities, for example the urgency to work with respect to penalty clauses” (e.g., violation in the absence of servicing the first work item), “or the value of the customer according to some model (step s4). For example, the OSS agent 31 will price urgent work low, so that it is easier for the mediator agents 28, 29 to buy it”, “the mediator agent 28, 29 for the workgroup may decide not to bid for the work (step s8), but instead waits for the next offer on the next available work item (step s6).” ¶ 0015: “[t]he OSS agent 31 informs a selected mediator agent 29 that its bid has been successful (step s14). The mediator agent 29 then allocates/sells the work on to the workers (step s15).” In a broadest reasonable interpretation, in order to wait for the next offer on the next available work item, a bidding process have been initiated and when the bid has been successful, the bidding process is complete. Therefore, the OSS agent determine the times to initiates and complete the bidding process in order to provide a service to a work item by reflecting its business priorities, for example, as discussed above an urgent work. See also figure 4 which illustrates the bidding process.

Art Unit: 3623

In response to argument 8, Examiner respectfully disagrees. BT teaches a first set of resources in Figure 3, Workgroup 1 e.g., a plurality of members. In addition, Mediator Agent 28 belongs to Workgroup 1, e.g., a first set of resources and Mediator Agent 29 belongs to Workgroup 2, e.g., a second set of resources as illustrated in figure 3. Each workgroup includes a plurality of workers, wherein each worker can buy/bid a work, as disclosed in ¶ 0015: “[t]he mediator 29 then allocates/sells the work on to the workers (step s15). In essence, the mediator agent 29 sells the work to the workers by offering work that they want to do (it learns this over time, by looking at what work the worker buys from the market), at a price that offsets its investment in purchasing the work from the OSS agent 31.” Therefore, workers are members too.

In response to argument 9, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Please see the response to arguments 2-8.

In response to argument 10, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Please see the response to arguments 2-8.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner’s answer.

Art Unit: 3623

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nadja Chong/

Examiner, Art Unit 3623

/Beth V. Boswell/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3623

Conferees:

Beth V. Boswell /bvb/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3623

Alexander Kalinowski/AK/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3691